2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

000 hurry or else it was an expression frequently used to rationalize their casual manner. I never saw a peasant with a watch.

101 These quiet people of Dragalevtsy, whose way of life is not very different from that of peasants throughout the Balkans, are more than just Bulgarian peasants who arose in the seventh century from a dash of Tartar added to a predominantly Slavic mixture. They are a special breed of Bulgarians called *Shopi,* a term originally meaning boorish. That is, a *Shop* was a bumpkin. Some authorities say that this term was derived from *sop,* the long staff which the men of this area carried. Since those living in the *Shopsko* area, or the immediate vicinity of Sofia and Mount Vitosha, are in general more conservative than villagers elsewhere in Bulgaria, the word *Shopi* also carried the idea [144] of backwardness and mental simplicity. Among the many attempts to explain the special physical characteristics of these people, the most plausible theory is that of descent from the Pechenegi, or Mongolian tribesmen who infiltrated into that section of Bulgaria and nearby eastern Serbia in the eleventh century. Historians deal none too kindly with these Pechenegi; nor do the *Shopi* receive many compliments in contemporary accounts. Even their physical appearance is considered unattractive by many other Bulgarians.

142 From faces naturally swarthy, further darkened and weather-beaten by sun, rain, and biting winds, the small round eyes of Asia stare through one without giving an inkling of the impression registered. In the thin-lipped mouths of the young the teeth are gleaming white; beneath the drooping mustaches of middle-aged men teeth show yellowish in a rare childlike smile; and toothless gums accompany [302] the gray stubbly beards of the old. Straight, prominent noses lend ruggedness rather than beauty; the customary clipping of the scraggly black hair of the men reveals wrinkled, leathery necks; the hair of the women is worn in braids down the back, and hangs from beneath a kerchief that covers the top of the head. Here, too, age is clearly marked. The glossy, thick braids of the girls all too soon become, with advancing years, dull and thin and are often pieced out with other, brighter hair. The men are of medium height. Because their shoulders are so broad and their chests so powerful, their short, sturdy legs seem out of proportion. The women, slightly shorter, walk erect

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

One account in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* describes their[1] nomadic existence and the camps they formed out of rings of wagons. "They wore long beards and mustachios, and were dressed in long kaftans. The food of the wealthy was blood and mares' milk; of the poor, millet and mead. They were originally 'magicians', i.e., fire-worshippers; but a form of Islam early became current among them, and the nation was temporarily converted to Christianity in 1007-1008. They were the most dreaded and detested of all the nomads." They were disagreeable in other ways too. But when the writer goes on to describe the *Shopi* of today, the descendants of these Pechenegi, as "despised by the other inhabitants of Bulgaria for their bestiality and stupidity but dreaded for their savagery," I wondered how much he was letting historical antecedents influence his description of the present. He goes on to say: "They are a singularly repellent race, short-legged, yellow-skinned, with slanting eyes and projecting cheekbones. Their villages are generally filthy, but the women's costumes show a barbaric profusion of gold lace." The *Shopi* then have quite a reputation to live up to—bestial, stupid, savage, ugly, filthy, and barbaric in their tastes. Some of these definitely do apply. My version of the *Shopi* necessarily includes some positive as well as negative traits, for I have lived among them and have learned to see their good as well as their bad points.

But I must admit that if one looks to the Bulgarian ancestors of the *Shopi* for the origin of the parricide story, he will also find forebears capable of such a deed. According to Henry N. Brailsford's *Macedonia* the Volga-men, or Bulgarians, "were polygamists, owned slaves, and were accustomed to military discipline. Like the Turks they shaved their heads and wore pigtails. They burned their widows and indulged in human sacrifices." This is not a pretty picture, but one which bears marked resemblances to the accounts of the tribes in western Europe before the spread of civilization to that area.

The killing of feeble parents has been a common practice among nomadic peoples because of the difficulty of caring for the aged and infirm when on the move. The mention of grain in the story quoted above would indicate that the tribe had settled down, and that parri-

[1] [i.e. the Pechenegi, Bulgarian ancestors--ANALYST]

BULGARIA-PAST & PRESENT

ETHNOGRAPHY

000 In a chapter of Prof. Wm. McDougall's book the „Group Mind". consecrated to the study of the Mind of a Nation, the eminent sociologist dwells at length on the importance of both mental and racial homogeneity of a population as a condition for a harmonious development of national character and collective mental life. It must be regretfully admitted that in the case of the Bulgarian people, the conditions are extremely adverse and this will go a long way to explain its chequered historical career, the rather volcanic character of its politics, and the difficulties which wrecked the disinterested efforts of its patriots to appease and unite ever-warring and contending factions.

144 Prof. Pittard of Geneva, a reputed anthropologist, affirms:

„Au point de vue anthropologique les Bulgares ne constituent pas nulle part, pas davantage dans le royaume que dans le Dobroudja une 'race' pure. Par tous leurs 'caractères morphologiques: la stature, le crâne, la face, ils marquent une hétérogénéité que les autres Etats balkaniques ne montrent pas au même degré. La nation Bulgare est un complex ethnique qui semble avoir eté formé avec les éléments humains de toute la péninsule. „La Roumanie". p. 229).

Dr. Krum Drontsilov in his Etudes Anthropogéographiques, p. 136, published by the Sofia University 1923 admits: " The natives of western Bulgaria (Dragoman) like Bulgarians of other regions, do not represent a homogeneous group so far as their corporeal characteristics are concerned. One remarks among them several distinct national elements which have been mixed". In another essay published also under the auspices of the University of Sofia in 1921 he affirms:

The Bulgarian people present a very great mixture, the crossing of types still continues but it has not yet created a uniform physical type. Observations and measurements show that in bodily

144 structure Bulgarians of different regions show great, even striking difference".

141 The author presents the results of his observations in Macedonia which show a very great variety in measurements as have been ascertained among the 491 cases which form the basis of his data. Natives of Western Macedonia are according to him distinctly brachycephalic, and differ considerably from those of Eastern Macedonia among whom the dolichocephalic predominate as may be seen form the appended table:

Dolichocephalic		Mesocephalic		Brachycephalic		Huperbrachycephalic	
Index: 68·3 to 75		75·1—80		80·1—85		85·1—98·1	
Western Macedonia	Eastern Macedonia	W.M.	E.M.	W.M.	E.M.	W.M.	E.M.
Cases		Cases		Cases		Cases	
3	37	15	126	79	75	146	10

It is worth comparing these figures with those of A. C. Hadon, ("The races of man") who states that the cephalic index of the Bulgarians varies from 78 on the coast to 85 in the west, and gives as their average stature 1·69 m.

144 175 These views ars confirmed by Prof. A. Ishirkov, who in his "Etude historicoethnographique sur la population du royaume de Bulgarie", remarks that there is no distinctive Bulgarian type and that the people are extremely differentiated. In his survey, he refers to some of the racial elements which have served to build up the Bulgarian people. Thracians, Greek settlers on the Black Sea coast and banks of the Danube, Persians who invaded and occupied Thrace as far as the Struma in 513 B. C., Scythians and the Ghettae, Macedonians, who under Lysimachus occupied all Danubian Bulgaria and the Dobrudja. In the 3rd century B. C. came an invasion of Celts who settled south of the Balkans and built their principal town Tile, in the valley of roses. (this settlement survives under the name of Tulovo) They gradually fell under Hellenic influ-

144 175 ence, their last king, Kavar, minted coins with Greek inscriptions. Some 100,000 Bastarni, a Germanic tribe were settled in Thrace about 280 A. D. by the Emperor Probus. For centuries Roman influence was predominant in the Balkans having penetrated into western Bulgaria as early as 229 B. C. The country was permanently occupied by 5 legions and as many auxiliary troops and many Roman towns founded. Bulgaria to the north of the Balkans was completely Romanised and a further influx of Romans took place on the evacuation of Dacia by the Emperor Aurelian. The historian Priscus affirms that Latin was widely spoken in Danubian Bulgaria in the 5th century. Later came the Goths and Slavs, who overran the whole peninsula, closely followed by the Bulgarians who gave their name to the country. There were two streams of Bulgarians one under Asparuch from Bessarabia and which settled in 679 in North Eastern Bulgaria, and another under Kubert from Pannonia, which settled in Macedonia near Monastir about 670 to 675.

Prof. Ishirkov's analysis is far from complete. Invasions of Moesia by Bulgarians are recorded by Theophanes (Bonnae p. 338/9) in the year 531. While in Marcellini Comitis Chronicon, Migne LI. and Theophylact Simocat VII. 4. references are made to Bulgarian settlements in the valley of the Yantra river in Northern Bulgaria about 535 and 585 respectively. This is explained by the fact that the Emperor Zeno according to John of Antioch, called in the Bulgarians to his help when at war with the Ostrogoths and that subsequently Vitallian also appealed to them for help against Anastassius. It is recorded that in 517, Kutrigurs or Bulgars, had appeared as far south as the Thermopylae, and Justinian is said to have received 2,000 of them, and to have settled them in Thrace. Towards the end of the first Bulgarian Empire however, still greater and more fundamental changes occurred in the ethnogra-

ETHNOGRAPHY

phic composition of the population so that one may safely declare that the Bulgarians have nothing Slavonic except their language, and that they are in an overwhelming proportion descendants of various Hunnish tribes. On his advent in Bulgaria, Asparuch found it occupied partly by Slavs, of whom there were to all appearances seven small tribes (Theophanes, De Boor 359.12) which were finally subjugated by the Bulgarians. But the ranks of these Slavs must have been very much thinned since the Emperor Justinian II transferred some 30,000 to Asia Minor, while the Byzantine historians Nichephorus and Theophanes reported that in 761 another body of 208,000 Slavs also migrated from Bulgaria to Asia Minor. While the Slavs were being removed, numerous Syrian and Armenian colonists were being settled by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine V in Thrace and the plain of the Maritsa. Later in the 9th century, some 200,000 Armenians were settled around Philippopolis (Jovan Cvijić: "La Peninsule Balkanique" p 476).

The Slavs did not find in the Bulgarians congeniai companions and they preferred to trek elsewhere because on the whole the Bulgarians were extremely warlike, while the Slavs were a pacific folk. In a letter of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus to the Tsar Symeon, in which the former was advocating the necessity of concluding a treaty of peace between their respective countries, he stresses the fact that some 20,000 Bulgarians had fled their country in a year and sought refuge in the Byzantine Empire as they were disgusted with Symeon's warlike spirit. The weakening of the Slav element was further intensified by the policy of colonisation of the Slavonic districts in Macedonia by peoples from all parts of the Byzantine Empire which was inauguratsd in 809 by the Emperor Nicephorus. (Theophanes p. 486 10—23).

After the death of Symeon, Bulgaria completely

144 175 exhausted by the wars she had waged, rapidly collapsed. Five Magyar incursions completely ravaged the country. On their heels came Sviatoslav's Russians in 967 who captured the great Bulgarian stronghold of Silistra and decimated the Bulgarians. It was only with the help of John Zimisces that they were finally driven off two years later and Bulgaria south of the Danube became a Byzantine province, and only the western part under the Tsar Samuel where the Bulgarian element survived in force, was able to ward off the Byzantines until 1018. But submission to the Byzantines did not secure for Eastern Bulgaria exemption from further invasions. In 1048 some 800,000 Petsenegs crossed the frozen Danube and the Byzantines settled them in the region around Sofia and Nisch and Ovtse Pole in Macedonia. In 1064, some 600.000 Kumans invaded Bulgaria and advanced into Thrace and Macedonia. These were veritable migrations affirms M. Yanko Sakuzov in his history of the Bulgarians (p. 121). He derives his figures from the eminent Russian historian Wassilievsky whose two book „The 2nd Bulgarian Empire", and „Byzantia and the Petsenegi" are the best documented on this particular period. In 1079 a yet further invasion of Petsenegs and Kumans took place, they penetrated into Thrace and even threatened Constantinople The Emperor Alexis Comnenus was so alarmed that he appealed to the west for help. These Petsenegs and Kumans must have completely swamped the Bulgarians and what few Slav remnants had survived until then in Bulgaria. The Crusaders when traversing Bulgaria in 1096 had to battle mainly with Petsenegs. Albertus, Bishop of Aix, who compiled a history of the expedition to Jerusalem from the year 1095 to 1121 makes vivid allusion to the „Petsenegs who live in Bulgaria".

This explains why the Byzantine chronicler Nikita Akominat who is the main source of documentation con-

144 cerning the period relating to the restoration of the 2nd
175 Bulgarian Empire, refers to Bulgarians as living mainly in Macedonia, while the inhabitants of present day Bulgaria he refers to as Vlachs or Wallachs. Other Byzantine writers however, such as G. Acropolites and G. Codinus mention that the population was composed of both Bulgarians and Vlachs, and this is to some extent confirmed by such chronicles as have been left by the Crusaders. Such as Ansberte's „Ystoria de expeditione Friderici imperatoris", though Ansberte in a passage referring to the military help which Tsar Peter offered to Frederick Barbarossa against Constantinople mentions only 40,000 Vlachs and Kumans and no Bulgarians Villehardouin again calls tne ruler of Bulgaria: „Johanis le Blac; li reis de Blaquie et de Bogrie", Professor Zlatarski, in a study published by the Bulgarian Academy in 1933 rightly expresses the view that the Assenide dynasty was of Kumanian stock. It was certainly owing to their close relationship with the Kumans that they were able to appeal for assistance to their kinsmen across the Danube, And it was only with their support that they successfully revolted against the Byzantines. Naturally the question arises whence this sudden apperance of Vlachs in Bulgaria? Must we accept as likely Weigand's theory that the Rumanian nationality was formed in Bulgaria between 600 and 900 and then gradually moved north across the Danube and that therefore these Vlach subjects of the Assenide dynasty were but a rearguard which had not yet trekked northward? It would be rather more logical to explain the use of the term Vlach as a synonym for Kuman, owing to the long cohabitation of these two peoples in Wallachia and to their being mistaken for one another.

The advent of the Petshenegs and Kumans in Bulgaria relegated henceforth the original Bulgarian invaders

144 175 to a back place, for the Kumanian Assenides were followed yet by other Kumanian Tsars on the throne of Bulgaria, those of the Terter dynasty and finally the Shishmans. The Dobrudja too, became an independent Kuman fief under the Kuman boliar Balik, from whom the Black Sea port Baltchik derives its name, as does the whole province from that of his son Dobrotitch. Other invasions of Kumans are recorded, in 1233, and still later after the Tartars had begun pressing them in their homeland in Wallachia. In their wake the Tartars too made their appearance in Bulgaria and repeatedly invaded the country, a son of the famous Han Nogai, Tsaka, was crowned in 1299 at Tirnovo as Bulgarian ruler though his reign was ephemeral. Soon after came the Turks who dominated the country for five centuries. It is strange that students of Bulgarian history have not taken seriously the irruption of the Petsenegs and Kumans in Bulgaria in the 11th century and still nourish the illusion that the Bulgarians are Slavs. These mass migrations must have completely metamorphosed the ethnic basis of the population. There are no estimates of the Bulgarian population of that period, but the first Turkish census reported by Ubicini places the total population of the Danube vilayet in 1876 at 2,591,116 of whom 1,535,466 were recorded as Christians; this after five centuries of relative peace and prosperity, so that it may be easily assumed that the population of Bulgaria prior to the irruption of over a million and a half of Petsenegs and Kumans in the 11th century must have been extremely sparse and practically overwhelmed by such an influx. The greatest marvel is the survival of the Slav tongue in their midst but this must be ascribed mainly to its use in the Church, the clergy being the only cultural force in existence at the time. We can easily gauge its influence by what happened in Rumania where the Slavonic liturgy had been adopted and used until the 18th

197

1: Karutz--59 E-4 (no date) 1925 E1 Europe
Bulgaria E1

/88/ The Bulgarians

000 1. Hair dress of young women, with tresses decorated with silver. 2. and 3. Decorative pendants. 4. Head ornament of the brides, made of flowers and silver coins. 5. Woman wearing an embroidered blouse and a woven carpet apron. 6. Drawing well. 7. Neck ornament. 8. Hand mill for salt. 9. Threshing sled. 10. Cave dwelling on the Lon. 11. Fire saw. 12. Village street. 13. Shelter of the field herders. 14. Household altar. 15. Rattle board of wood, from a monastery. 16. Signalling horn of a country mailman. 17. Sawing frame[1]

175 101 144 At the time of the Romans present-day Bulgaria was called Moesia in its northern (Danube) region, Thracia in its southern section, and it was inhabited by an Indo-European people of North European extraction, at the time when old Greek, and later Roman and Byzantine, immigrants moved there and intermingled with it. From the sixth century on, the Slavic wave moved closer, and from the seventh century onwards Finnish Turko-Tataric migrant herders and horse breeders repeatedly found their way into this country from the middle Volga. 463 From these the Bulgarians adopted and kept the herding system, by the side of which the Thracian and Slavic agriculture was maintained. The Ottoman Turks coming from the southeast provided the country 181 with its class of craftsmen and tradesmen. This mosaic of races and peoples developed a particularly powerful and healthy stock of people whose high life expectancy is well known, as well as a temperate, 531 industrious, and sober character. It mirrors a corresponding multiplicity 177 of cultures; thus we have in art types that range from the Scythian style and its predilection for phantastic animal forms to the Byzantine and ancient Oriental motifs; from the cellular stone inlays of the period of the Teutonic migrations (belt clasps) to the Tatar decorative pendants (Figures 2, 3, and 7),[2] and from the Slavic joy in ornamentation and 592 colors to the Turkish, recent Near Eastern household industries. The Slavic household community, which takes up every new generation into the fabric of the family, has as its consequence the form of settlement 342 by individual and separate farmsteads. Aside from occasional underground dwelling pits in the loess, of which only the pointed roof of rushes rises above the ground, there are one-story high, rectangular panel-work houses covered with loam, placed either on a level with the soil, or else on top of a wooden substructure for the working sheds.

[1] [For illustrations, see 1: Karutz, E1 Europe, cat. 116, p. 59a -- Analyst]
[2] [See 1: Karutz, E1 Europe, cat. 116, p. 57a -- Analyst]